



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/520,494

01/07/2005

Andreas Finke

5255-37PUS

9782

27799

7590

09/18/2007

COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE

551 FIFTH AVENUE

SUITE 1210

NEW YORK, NY 10176

EXAMINER

STRIMBU, GREGORY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3634

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/520,494	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FINKE, ANDREAS	
	<b>Examiner</b> Gregory J. Strimbu	<b>Art Unit</b> 3634	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/27/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Drawings***

The drawing correction filed June 27, 2007 has been approved.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The recitation “the bearing shaft” on line 2 of claim 16 renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear to which of the plurality of bearing shafts set forth above the applicant is referring.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10-12, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Karita (US 4876765). Karita discloses a linear drive arrangement for a sliding door, the arrangement comprising:

a guide track 105;

a stator arrangement 141 which is fixed with respect to said guide track;

a guide carriage 111, 114 to which a door leaf 101 of the sliding door can be fixed for movement parallel to said guide track;

a plurality of permanent magnets 131, 132 fixed to said guide carriage so that the guide carriage can be suspended by magnetic forces between said stator arrangement and said magnets, said stator arrangement, said magnets, and the unit 142 forming a linear drive for the door leaf; and

at least one supporting roller 121 which supports said guide carriage on said guide track when said carriage is not fully suspended by said magnetic forces;

wherein the rollers 121 are disposed at front and rear ends of the of the guide carriage as shown in figure 4;

wherein two supporting rollers 121 are arranged on one side of the guide carriage as shown in figure 5;

wherein at least one of the supporting rollers rolls on the guide track as movement of the guide carriage begins and ends.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 13, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karita as applied to claims 10-12, 17 and 18 above, and further in view of Tucker (US 3105272). Tucker discloses a door system comprising a plurality of rollers 16, each said roller is journaled on a bearing shaft 36 which is received through a bore hole in a

guide carriage 32, wherein each said bearing shaft 36 has a first end (not numbered, but shown in figures 3 and 5) on which a respective said roller is journaled eccentrically with respect to the axis of the shaft, wherein each said roller is detachable from the bearing shaft.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Karita with an adjustment means, as taught by Tucker, to increase the ease with which the position of the door can be adjusted relative to the surrounding frame.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karita as applied to claims 10-12, 17 and 18 above, and further in view of Redman et al. (US 5070575). Redman et al. discloses a door system comprising a plurality of rollers 50, each said roller is journaled on a bearing shaft 70 which is received through a bore hole 88 in a guide carriage 80, wherein each said bearing shaft 70 has a first end 62 on which a respective said roller 50 is journaled eccentrically with respect to the axis of the shaft, each said bearing shaft has a second end (not numbered, but shown in figure 4) provided with a threaded bore 68 which receives a fastening screw 32.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Karita with an adjustment means, as taught by Redman et al., to increase the ease with which the position of the door can be adjusted relative to the surrounding frame.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed June 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the applicant's comments concerning Karita, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Karita meets the limitations of claim 10 since the magnets form a part of the linear drive for the door leaf 101. Therefore, the linear drive of Karita comprises the stator arrangement 141, the magnets 131, 132, and the unit 142 and anticipates the invention as recited in claim 10. With respect to claim 18, the rollers 121 roll on the guide track as movement of the carriage begins and ends. Claim 18 does not require the rollers not roll on the guide track for movement of the carriage between the beginning and ending movements of the carriage.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3634

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory J. Strimbu whose telephone number is 571-272-6836. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Glessner can be reached on 571-272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Gregory J. Strimbu  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3634  
September 12, 2007